UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,504	03/31/2004	Jewel Tracy	20031124-001	6464
Roger L. Belfay	7590 07/17/200 7	EXAMINER		
829 Tuscarora A Saint Paul, MN	Avenue	LANDRUM, EDWARD F		
Saint Paul, Min	33102		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/814,504	TRACY, JEWEL	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Edward F. Landrum	3724	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 July 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL		-	
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extractional extractional extractional extraction of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [·	•	_
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:	ided below or appended.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but		•	
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Boyer D. Ashley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3724			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Regarding the drawings and new matter Figures 1-6 all contain new matter. In Figures 1 and 6 applicant has amended the location of the guide slots 8 from being directly adjacent the outer edges of the sanitary covering material 2 to a small distance away from the outer edges. These are considered the outer edges because the outer edges are the same width as the roll of sanitary covering material. Furthermore, applicant has added a dotted line to show the locations, and it is not understood what this is supposed to represent as the frame 5 is not shown in any original drawing as having any portion extending above the sanitary covering material.

Regarding Figures 2 and 5, applicant has added a line extending longitudinally above the sanitary covering material 2. Examiner believes applicant is trying to show structure the slot is composed of. Applicant however has not provided any structure of the slot in the originially filed disclosure and showed previously in Figures 2 and 5 that the frame 5 did not extend above or in the same plane as the sanitary covering material. Therefore this newly added line is new matter.

Regarding Figures 3 and 6, the originally filed specification states "for positioning said sanitary covering material on any floor to provide a sanitary area for a user to stand" (Brief Summary of the Invention lines 1-3; Detailed Description lines 1-3), and that "A material which adheres to the floor 3 surface on which the foot frame 1 will be used should be chosen to minimize the propensity for the user to slip and fall when mounting and dismounting the foot frame". Applicant never states in the specification that the portion of the sanitary material that would adhere to the floor is within the sanitary area and this cannot be infered as the embodiment shown in Figures 4-6 show that a take up roller 7 need not be used and therefore it is possible the sanitary covering material can rolled onto and contact the floor such that when a user steps off the foot frame 1 the user could still step on sanitary material outside of the frame to avoid slipping. Furthermore, since originially filed Figures 3 and 6 show the frame 5 as a solid piece with no interior holes the addition of the hole in the frames of Figures 3 and 6 is new matter.

Regarding the amendment to claim 1, the sanitary covering area has been defined in the specification as the area within the first through fourth sides of the frame. If the sanitary covering material was in contact with any floor there are several instances where the sanitary area would not be entierly planar and parallel to the floor. Furthermore, the above recited portions of the disclosure never states that the sanitary material ever contacts the floor, only that the material is capable of adhering to the floor surface. Therefore this limitation is new matter.

material ever contacts the floor, only that the material is capable of adhering to the floor surface. Therefore this limitation is new matter. Regarding examiner's 112 2nd rejection, applicant has not amended the claims to overcome these rejections. The lack of antecedent basis issue in claims 1 and 9 are flound in lines 7 and 8 respectively and have to do with the limitation of "said sanitary surface" not the sanitary covering material. Replacing "said" with "a" just creates additional problems with the claims as not two different sanitary covering materials have been claimed that will result in specification and drawing objections.